



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/164.580 10/01/98 ARNOLD

R TI-22561

023494 MMC1/0829
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS TX 75265

EXAMINER

MITCHELL, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2822

DATE MAILED:

08/29/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/164,580

Applicant(s)

ARNOLD ET AL.

Examiner

James Mitchell

Art Unit

2822

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 1998.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed October 01, 1998.

Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-16 drawn to device, classified in class 257, subclass 48.
- II. Claims 17-21, drawn to process of manufacture, classified in class 438, subclass 11.

3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

4. Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process. For example, disposing interconnect prior to die.

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143). Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of

at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

7. During a telephone conversation with the attorney on Wade Brady a provisional election was made May 29, 2001 with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I., claims 1-16. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 17-21 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Drawings

8. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the bumps formed on the interconnection aligned with the terminals must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

9. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Farnworth et al. (U.S 5,815,000).

10. Farnworth discloses a package (14) with a cavity (Fig.1), a plurality of terminals (40), a die (12) with bond pads (Fig.7, Item 62), an interconnecting layer (16) with electrically conductive paths (58,60) of a first and second region wherein said first region is aligned with bond pad of die (Fig. 7A) and an interconnection via wirebonds

(Fig. 3, Item 44) between said second region and terminals, and in the alternate aligned bumps formed on said second region (Line 56-57, Column 7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 2,4,6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farnworth as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Johnson (U.S 6,229,319) and Potter (U.S 6,028,437).

13. Farnworth does not show the interconnect bumps aligned with and in contact with the terminals or a compliant bump with a standoff wherein the standoff's height is less than said bump.

However, Johnson utilizes an alignment of bumps and contacts (Fig. 2A).

14. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to align the bumps on the interconnect with the contacts on the peripheral of package in order to form an electrical communication as taught by Johnson (Lines 16-19, Column 4).

15. Further, Potter utilizes a compliant bump, and a standoff with a height less than said bump (Lines 3-5, Column 2).

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the test structure of Farnworth and Johnson by incorporating a compliant bump with a standoff

of lesser height for improved electrical contact (abstract) and to prevent overdeformation of the bump as taught by Potter (Lines 1-2, Column2).

17. Claims 5,7 and 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farnworth in view of Potter (U.S 6,028,437).

18. Farnworth discloses elements recited in paragraph 10 and further a flexible interconnect formed of Silicon (Lines 1-2, Column 3).

19. Farnworth does not show a compliant bump with a standoff wherein the standoff's height is less than said bump.

20. However, Potter utilizes a compliant bump, and a standoff with a height less than said bump (Lines 3-5, Column 2).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the test structure of Farnworth by incorporating a compliant bump with a standoff of lesser height for improved electrical contact (abstract) and to prevent overdeformation of the bump as taught by Potter (Lines 1-2, Column2).

Conclusion

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Mitchell whose telephone number is (703) 305-0244. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30-8:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead Jr. can be reached on (703) 308-4083. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

Application/Control Number: 09/164,580

Page 6

Art Unit: 2822

305-3432 for regular communications and (703) 305-3230 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

jmm
August 25, 2001

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Smith".

MATTHEW SMITH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800